DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 650 EA 024 239

AUTHOR Young, Beth
TITLE Not "There" Yet: A Canadian Perspective on the Knowledge Base in Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Females; *Feminism; Foreign Countries; Literature Reviews; Politics of Education; *Research Needs; Research Problems; Sex Discrimination; *Women Administrators
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

A feminist perspective on educational administration in Canada is provided in this paper, which reviews feminist critiques of educational administration research and offers a synthesis of contemporary Canadian feminist research. The main thesis is that the Canadian knowledge base has begun to incorporate the concepts of "Canadian" and "education"; however, Canadian women's experiences have rarely been considered. A conclusion is that gender continues to be a nonissue for many Canadian academics in educational administration. A feminist critique challenges the existing Canadian knowledge base by examining evolving gender roles and the implications of the intersection of gender with race, class, and age. The Canadian knowledge base has yet to understand and accept various ways of knowing and types of knowledge. Work toward reconceptualizing notions and reshaping organizations must continue. (Contains 70 references.) (LMI)

Not "There" Yet: A Canadian Perspective on the Knowledge Base in Educational Administration

Beth Young
Dept. of Educational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

A Paper Prepared
for Presentation at the
Symposium:

International Perspectives
on the
Knowledge Base in Educational Administration

AERA Annual Meeting
April 20-24, 1992
San Francisco, CA

Oh, Canada

What does the "Ed. Admin. knowledge base" debate look like to an anglo-Canadian feminist academic? In this paper, I hope to explore what it's like to be a Canadian "doing" educational administration next door to the United States and to offer my sense of what is being and has been accomplished in Canadian English-language educational administration.[1] Then, rather than reiterating the excellent and extensive feminist critiques of research in educational administration that have already been carried out (e.g. Shakeshaft, 1991), I'll provide a feminist perspective on the Canadian scene. This will be a continuation of my earlier effort to collect and begin to synthesize the contemporary Canadian feminist research about school administration (Young, 1990).

My thesis is that we have begun to build "Canadian" and "education" into our knowledge base but, as yet, that has rarely included the explicit consideration of Canadian women's experiences and perspectives. Although I focus exclusively on Canadian scholarship in this paper, let me say at the outset that I am not promoting a strictly parochial approach to the knowledge base issue. I believe, however, that -- in our eagerness to be part of the international community of scholars -- Canadian Ed. Admin. academics have under-rated the importance of coming to know ourselves. It seems to me that, in doing this, we have also overlooked potential contributions that we might be making to comparative studies of educational administration. I hope that my own treatment of these issues may renew discussion about the adequacy of the existing Canadian knowledge base in educational administration.

At this time, the public agenda in Canada and also the private agenda of many Canadian citizens is coloured by the struggle to live with -- let alone celebrate -- the geographic, political, linguistic, socio-cultural diversity within our borders. We have in the past been pleased to describe ourselves as a cultural mosaic. But these days, we seem to be a mosaic coming unglued. Some of the pieces of the Canadian mosaic include the "French fact," our aboriginal peoples, our many other minority ethnic groups, women, and workers garbed in pink, blue, white, and plaid collars. The glue which has traditionally held the pieces together is what many of us believed to be our rather humane social and economic policies. However, our beliefs as well as our policies have been called into question; the old glue seems to have less stick-to-it-iveness these days. Of course, our

---

[1] That I am confining my discussion to work which has been presented in English, when Canada is an officially bilingual (English/French) nation, may be an inexcusable limitation but it is also indicative of the complex and fragmented nature of our knowledge base.

close examination of the pieces of our mosaic is being carried on in the at once strange and familiar context of this complex, rapidly changing internationalized world we all inhabit. And, peculiar to Canada, our self-study must be done in the sometimes chilly shade cast northward by our giant and dominating neighbor, the U.S.A.

In her opening keynote address to our Department's 35th Anniversary Conference in the fall of 1991, Naomi Hersom (1991, p. 9) identified three aspects of the Canadian situation that have particular significance for Canadian education and educators . She spoke of "our changing demography," of "our historical agreements concerning lands, language and religion," and of "our economic status internally [and globally]." If the Canadian mosaic survives, it will differ in the shapes, sizes, colours, and arrangement of its component pieces. Accordingly, we educators must bring new sorts of vision to our attempts at understanding the pictures embedded in the mosaic.

"Canadian" Educational Administration[2]

In Canada, education is a provincial/territorial responsibility, but there are some strong federal influences. For example, certain protections for denominational schooling are built into our Constitution. There is no national department or office of education, although federal monies are transferred to the provinces/territories for use in publicly funded post-secondary education and to support specific initiatives such as French immersion and job training programs. Moreover, the patriation of the Canadian constitution in 1982 brought with it the introduction of a national *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. *Charter* challenges on human rights issues are being heard regularly by our Supreme Court, causing Sussel and Manley-Casimir (1986, pp. 213-235) to raise the spectre of the Supreme Court as Canada's "National School Board". Our Supreme Court judges have subsequently and firmly refused that role, making it their business "to review decisions made by educational authorities in the light of the Charter and natural justice principles, but not to make educational policy" (Schwartz, 1992, private communication). Nonetheless, the impact of considerations arising from *Charter* rulings is significant for the administration of Canadian education.

The Tables of Contents for the handful of published-in-Canada, overview Educational Administration textbooks (e.g. Bezeau, 1989; Gue, 1977; Giles & Proudfoot, 1990; Lam,

---

[2] In addition to the sources I cite specifically, I am particularly indebted to Erwin Miklos for his detailed commentary on my commentary about the development of Canadian educational administration.

1990) reflect some of the Canadian realities I've been describing. Topics covered include the historical and contemporary implications of legislative/legal provisions, the issues related to our two official languages, aboriginal Canadians, special needs students, multicultural/lingualism, the role of locally elected boards of trustees, the growth of independent or private schools, the financing of public education and, now and then, a reference to the roles and status of women in education. However, those dimensions of our Canadian context just listed, and others that are not even mentioned, have yet to be fully articulated and explored.

An informed discussion of Canadian perspectives on the knowledge base rightly includes a historical look at the practice of Canadian school administration. Allison (1991) describes two aspects of the early development of Canadian educational administration that are pertinent. The first is the pervasiveness, until quite recently, of the small, rural school district across Canada. The extensive urbanization and consolidation of public schooling that occurred early this century in the United States began somewhat later in Canada, and varied in its progress from province to province and region to region. Concomitantly, the provincially "deployed and/or e. ployed [school] inspector" was the predominant administrative figure here until the 1960's, or later in some areas. These inspectors were carefully screened and almost invariably male. Apparently, neither they nor any one else seriously questioned their capability to supervise the many (often female) elementary school teachers in their purview, although their own teaching experiences were generally limited to secondary schools. The (male) school inspector was the symbol of the centralized, provincial control of public education throughout English-speaking Canada.

There were several factors supporting this centralization of authority. Allison (p. 18) suggests that there was "a shared need...to define and preserve" our nation's identity as distinct from that of the U.S. In Allison's view, Canadians also showed a typically colonial acceptance of legislated, centralized authority, in contrast to the attitude of our more rebellious neighbors across the 49th parallel. Of course, the concept of "apolitical" civil servants who are accorded considerable status and power is also very much part of the British tradition to which English Canada was an heir. Thus, until at least the middle of the 20th century, school administration in English-speaking Canada was, as Allison puts it, "viewed more as a public service than an executive occupation." The view was personified by the elite corps of male secondary school educators turned school inspectors, who believed that administration should be the servant of education and who were themselves servants of the provincial departments of education.

In Quebec, the control of schooling remained largely in the hands of the Church, primarily the Roman Catholic church, until the 1960's. Deblois (1991) notes that only in these past 20 years has

the administration of schools passed to "lay people" (p. 8). Although the locus of control in this confessional system of schooling (Bezeau, 1989) resided in the church, neither the notion of centralized authority nor the gender of those invested with that authority (except in the case of convent schools run by nuns) differed from French to English-speaking Canada.

To continue with Allison's (p. 32) analysis, significant changes in the environment of practice did take place in and around Canadian education during the 1950's and 1960's. By and large, members of the Canadian school inspectorate were educated in the liberal arts tradition and few sought out graduate work in educational administration, even when they did go to the U.S. for graduate studies. However, two changes fostered a receptiveness to the academic study of educational administration. Both urbanization and school district consolidation gained momentum during the 1950's and early 1960's. Whether they were provincially or locally appointed, school district superintendents gained visibility and status as they faced the more complex administrative challenges presented by these larger school divisions.

These changes were the catalysts for the "transplanting" of educational administration as a field of academic study from U.S. to Canadian soil (Allison, 1991, p. 32). At the 1955 convention of the Canadian Education Association, discussions were held about the need for Canadian universities to become involved in the professional education of school administrators (Bergen & Quarshie, 1987. p. 1). In 1956, the Division of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta was established with the assistance of a five-year grant from the Kellogg Foundation. Graduate students from across the country arrived to be "educated" as Canadian school administrators. Much of the existing knowledge base had been constructed in and for the U.S. milieu and would be disseminated through American textbooks and American-educated professors (Allison, 1991, p.33; Hickcox, 1981, p. 1; Miklos, 1990, p. 1-4), although an awareness of the need to "construct" our own knowledge base is evident, for example, in the considerable proportion of U. of A. dissertations describing the "context of educational administration" during the early years of the Department's existence (Miklos, 1991, p.313). Thus was the first "Canadian" doctorate in educational administration awarded in 1958, about 50 years after the first Ed. Admin. doctorates were granted in the United States.

However, the increasing predominance of the theory movement in American "academic educational administration"[3] diminished the significance of that notion of context -- in our case, the history and

[3] I use this term as it has been defined by Allison, 1991, p. 1 to refer to "research and graduate study" in educational administration.

contemporary specifics of *Canadian* education and its administration. Moreover, as Allison (p. 3) points out, there was an urgent need among Canadian practitioners for a "professionalized" approach to educational administration, a development that did have some parallels with the much earlier introduction of academic educational administration in the U.S. Therefore, the transplant "took" to the extent that a slender Tree of Grand Theory sprouted and spread some branches across Canada (including the French-speaking programs in Quebec, according to Deblois, 1991, p. 12) as graduates from the University of Alberta's new Educational Administration program returned or moved in to high-ranking administrative positions in provincial departments/ministries of education and school systems, and into university faculty appointments. It is not surprising, then, to find Hickox (1980, p. 3) noting that the titles in a cumulative bibliography of Canadian educational administration materials published by the Canadian Education Association in 1973 "don't reflect much unique Canadian content."

Miklos (1990, p. 1-8) describes the the early doctoral research at the University of Alberta as "positivistic, functionalist, behaviorist, quantitative." This observation is drawn from Miklos' recent review of the 319 doctoral theses that were completed in the U. of A.'s Department of Educational Administration from the completion of the first doctorate in 1958 until 1990. The exception, as I have already noted, was some research conducted during the first two decades of the Department's life that described the legal, economic/financial, and demographic characteristics of the Canadian education context (1990, p. 4-16; Miklos, 1991, p. 313). But the dominant type of research conducted during that period was "associated with the theory movement," more concerned with theorizing than with practice per se. It was frequently conducted by means of questionnaire surveys, by a "researcher as scientist" in the manner of the positivistic social sciences (1991, p. 315).

According to Miklos (1990, pp. 5-23 & 5-24), a major focus of the research was organizational analysis, with particular emphasis on generic structural characteristics but little attention to "the distinctive quality" of the (Canadian educational) organizations that were studied. Another significant focus was "the relationships between individuals and organizations" as described and analyzed by means of variables related to personality and attitude, and by means of questionnaire surveys investigating organizational climate and job satisfaction (p. 6-26). As Miklos puts it, these studies "confirm the variety and complexity of organizational life," without providing the sought-after generalizable insights that were to have been the fruits of our youthful Tree of Grand Theory.

Speaking from within this milieu, Thom Greenfield, raised his voice in 1974 to challenge positivism and the theory movement. Greenfield, by then a professor at the Ontario Institute for

Studies in Education, had been a graduate student in educational administration at the U of A during those early days of the late 1950's and early 1960's. The "Greenfield declaration" (Deblois, 1979, p. 1) at the Third International Intervisitation Programme on Educational Administration in Bristol, was a catalyst for the subsequent "paradigm debates." Miklos (1990, p. 1-9) states that there was "no serious questioning [of the theory movement, in Canada] until the mid-70's." Once it began however, Deblois (1979) says that the questioning opened up discussions about what is "appropriate or inappropriate methodology to study school organizations" and about different ways of approaching pedagogy and curriculum.

My project here is to trace the impact of Greenfield's views on Canadian academic educational administration, rather than to reiterate the positions enunciated by much more established members of the international "knowledge base in educational administration" debating club. Allison (1991, p. 34) believes that Greenfield's challenge was received quite differently in the U.S. and in Canada. Some of the hostility with which Greenfield's notions were treated in the U.S. was grounded in the fear of a return to the "naked empiricism" that characterized the earliest period of American educational administration research. In Canada, where academic educational administration was in part a branch (trans)plant of the American Grand Theory tree, Allison suggests that "Greenfield's arguments [merely] posed an intellectually stimulating attack" on our traditional approach to educational administration. After all, we had but a short tradition. Allison believes, in agreement with Deblois, that the net effect of Greenfield's challenge on Canadian and Commonwealth educational administration has been to "stimulate...alternative approaches that have served to broaden the field" (p. 34). And more specifically, I would add, to contextualize that field by making positivist assumptions and goals problematic and shifting the focus from "objectivity' and generalizability to meaning, values, and milieu.

Writing in 1981, Greenfield made the startling assertion (startling to me, at least, reading it in 1992) that Canadian ed. admin. researchers "know very little about schools as schools in Canada and very little about the administration of them" (p. 17). He urged that we "ask ourselves what we see happening" (p. 25) in our schools. And, indeed, there is evidence that some Canadian educational administration scholars have lately been directing their attention to Canadian schools.

Greenfield made the above comments in a collection called What's so Canadian about Canadian Educational Administration? , edited by two OISE professors of educational administration, Richard Townsend and Stephen Lawton in 1981. The very title of this volume, let alone the project itself, signalled the new focus on meaning and context. Other contributors to the Townsend and Lawton collection, while presenting a range of viewpoints in response to the title's

question, reflected the increasing national self-consciousness of Canadian academics in educational administration.

A similar awareness and concern had been articulated in a slightly different form by a CASEA[4] committee that was charged at the 1979 CASEA annual meeting with investigating the potential for more systematic, coordinated educational administration research in Canada while acknowledging the diverse influences of provincial control. According to Bergen and Quarshie (1987, p. 20), the committee did return a report urging the initiation of programmatic research, "national in scope," which would assist in reducing the "unhealthy parochialism" and repetition of work within our various provinces, while promoting better understanding of "issues and problems that were common among the provinces." Discussion continues.

That particular recommendation might seem to be inspired by the grand theory approach, but I believe that it might as well have been an assertion of the importance of the particular(s), an acknowledgement that Canadian educational administration research had not been telling us much about Canadian schools and schooling. According to Bergen and Quarshie (1987, p. 20), the motion to look into more systematic research was made by Leslie Gue. That was probably not coincidental, since Dr. Gue had just published one of the few Canadian educational administration textbooks (1977) and had made a point of incorporating as much Canadian research as possible (Hickox, 1981, p. 4). Such a project must have made very clear both the repetition and the gaps in Canadian research, as well as the difficulty of locating and retrieving the research that had been done. Gue's book, by the way, while positivistic in outlook, does acknowledge the Greenfield challenge.

The incentives and supports for the meta-analysis, critique, synthesis, and dissemination of Canadian educational administration research are few. Allison (1991, p. 8, citing Newlon) notes that, in the U.S., textbooks on "school management and administration" were already being published in the first decade of this century. Given our short history and a much smaller professoriate (about 200 academics across Canada) and graduate student enrolment, the Canadian market for educational administration research is quite small (Hickox, 1981, p. 4). The only substantial market for book sales has been the students taking a compulsory course in educational administration as part of teacher preparation programmes, and the demand there is for an introductory overview textbook that can be used in various provinces despite differences in the types of teacher education programmes and provincial legislation. Moreover, our small population

---

4 Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration

limits the number of scholarly and professional journals that might be supported, although some do exist. So yet another avenue for the dissemination, synthesis, and discussion of pertinent Canadian research is severely constrained. Without the incentive of a large Canadian market for graduate-level textbooks, only a few attempts have been made to pull together and look over Canadian research in educational administration including graduate students' work.[5] As a result, it was and still is hard to get a sense of the "big picture," the mosaic of Canadian educational administration research -- as I have learned over the past few months while researching this paper.

Our difficulties are compounded by the absence of a national infrastructure related to education in general, due largely to provincial jurisdiction over education. This is manifest in our granting process through our major national funding agency, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (which has just been merged with another granting agency), as one example. Only a very limited number of applications for research in education are funded and, even then, there is very little systematic communication nationally about who holds research grants, to do what (that is, beyond annual announcements of recipients and project titles when grants are first awarded), much less systematic dissemination of reports on the funded research-in-progress (Levin, 1992). Given this situation, the rather piecemeal nature of educational administration research in this country is not surprising.

Nonetheless, during the 1980's, our scholars began -- or perhaps continued, but with more range and depth --to join *Canadian* and *education* with adminstration and to do so from interpretive and critical perspectives. For example, Miklos (1991, pp. 315-316) notes the emergence at the University of Alberta of doctoral research founded on a"broader definition of science," seeking "understandings from the perspective of the participant" by means of various forms of qualitative and interpretive case study approaches. This trend has not been limited to the U. of A., as exemplified by CASEA award-winning doctoral dissertations written at various Canadian universities in the past decade. In some Canadian educational administration departments, knowledge is now being constructed as often as truth is being discovered and, from time to time, a voice is even heard asking, "Who benefits?"

Doctoral research is one manifestation of prevailing attitudes toward knowledge and investigation in our small community of scholars, but there are others. A number of recent Canadian research programs and writings are characterized by the assumptions and approaches that Miklos describes.

---

5 Detselig Press of Calgary, Alberta does publish edited collections, on an occasional basis, as well as textbooks.

This work, some of which I mention briefly here to illustrate my point, has begun to build our knowledge about Canadian schools and contexts.

A number of examples of interpretive and critical research about Canadian-educational-administration deal with politics and policy, but others investigate administrative practice and the nature of organizations. Evans' (1991) deconstruction of school principals' everyday administrative values-in-practice and Deblois' (1991) tracing of the role of the principal in an evolving Quebec "educational landscape" provide two quite different examples of work that takes as its focus a value-oriented examination of "administrators and administration" (Miklos, 1990, p. 3-1). Spanning that focus and "planned" change is Haughey and Rowley's (1991) examination of the meaning some principals attached to their "work" as change agents in relation to "their philosophies of education and administration" (p. 8). Levin (1991) is undertaking a multi-faceted investigation of organizational responses to external change, including a school district among the organizations in the study. Coleman and LaRocque (1990) also studied school districts, combining quantitative and qualitative data within an interpretive framework to develop their concept of school district "ethos". A number of scholars are providing much-needed Canadian content with respect to policy and politics. Re-viewing the Canadian context as a Franco-Albertan, Tardif (1990, 1991) examines issues related to French language education including the reinforcement of linguistic and cultural identity in official-language minority schools. Maynes (1991) investigates a substantive social concern -- poverty -- in a particular setting. Schwartz (1986) analyses critically the politics of a particularly infamous case of teaching prejudice. MacKay (1990) offers meta-analysis of several policy studies related to one provincial department of education. These examples of contemporary Canadian scholarship that are concerned with meaning, context, and values contribute not only to "what we see happening" in Canadian education but also to our ways our understanding of what we see.

In 1981, Townsend and Lawton (p. viii) commented that "Canada is a crossroads where contending perspectives have met, and that Canada's role is to mediate eclectically between Europe's philosophic and the American technocratic streams of thought." When I asked Margaret Haughey, who is a regular participant in "knowledge base" discussions in Canada and also the current president of CASEA, to comment on the "knowledge base issue" in Canadian educational administration today, she (1992) spoke about the "Canadian middle ground" that has been achieved in the past few years. By that she meant "getting beyond either/or attitudes and achieving acceptance of multiple ways of knowing." She attributes current attitudes in part to an emphasis on learning from practice as a means to building the knowledge base, starting in our teacher preparation programs but influencing research and graduate programs in educational administration

as well (e.g. Grimmett and colleagues, various publications; LaRocque, work in progress). She cited as another example the CASEA symposium on the "knowledge base" in educational administration that Miklos organized in the early 1980's. Few of those in attendance disputed the positions articulated by Greenfield, Hodgkinson, and Deblois (the symposium panelists). That may be, in part, a statement about those who did and did not attend the session.

The shift to qualitative research in Canadian academic educational administration circles may, in some cases, be based on unexamined positivistic assumptions, equating "qualitative" with "interpretive" and failing to recognize the possibility of underlying epistemological distinctions (Greenfield, 1992; MacKinnon, Young, & Hansen,1990, p. 40). Words like "truth" and "reality" are still used rather carelessly by many. However, Benjamin Levin (1992), the current programme chair for CASEA, points out that new programmes of research in a number of areas are emerging as new scholars enter Canadian departments of educational administration. It will be interesting to see over the next few years whether our Canadian crossroads have led to a middle ground that fosters knowledge generation based on genuinely non-positivistic assumptions.

Some of us will continue to make problematic the knowledge base issue in Canadian educational administration. No one, surely, would deny Greenfield's influence as writer, but also as teacher and colleague in Canadian educational administration circles (e.g. Deblois, 1992, private communication). Likewise, Hodgkinson has been a continuing presence and contributor, making concerns about values and morality part of our intellectual landscape. Even so, are we asking as many thoughtful questions grounded in and related to Canadian education, its social and historical context, and its administration, as we might (Allison, 1991; Schwartz, 1992; Townsend & Lawton, 1981)? When will we see the critical analysis, the synthesis, and the meta-analysis that needs to be undertaken and disseminated as an aid to better informed investigation (MacKay, 1990; Miklos, 1990)? And, where are the women in this world or these worlds of Canadian educational administration? What were and are their experiences? their realities? their voices?

Where are the Women?

Historically, as Nixon (1987, p. 64) puts it, "The tradition of women as teachers and men as principals and superintendents was well entrenched in Canada by the end of the nineteenth century." Danylewycz and Prentice (1986) caution against overly simplistic interpretations of the "feminization of teaching" during the nineteenth century but note the demanding variety of experiences and tasks encountered by women teachers, often in shockingly inadequate physical facilities (both the schools and the available living accommodation). While stressing that teaching

school did provide some Canadian women with a "liberating" opportunity to find employment on the western Canadian frontiers, and/or make the transition to other professional and political roles, the pattern they document is one of increasingly segregated (by grade and lower pay) and externally controlled work for these women.

Fleming, Smyly, and White (1990, pp. 7-31) describe vividly the demands and hardships, both physical and social, faced by many western women Canadian teachers particularly in rural and isolated communities. These women were virtually powerless, at the combined "mercy" of the local schools trustees who employed them and the male provincial inspectors who supervised them. The provincially appointed inspectors were themselves engaged in very demanding work -- a concerned, but very busy patriarchy of former secondary school teachers charged with supervising and supporting a widely dispersed array of teachers, largely female and teaching elementary school.

We know little enough, still, about our early women teachers but even less about our pioneer women administrators. Fleming and his colleagues have documented the lives and socio-historical contexts of two women who were educational administrators in British Columbia well before the second world war -- Lottie Bowron (Fleming, Smyly, & White, 1990) and Margaret Strong (Fleming & Craig, 1990). Neither woman enjoyed an extended career in her appointment; their stories, as related by Fleming and his colleagues, make an inviting topic for feminist analysis. No doubt there are other such stories of early women administrators and educational leaders which, when told, will provide another dimension to the history of educational administration and leadership in Canada.

In spite of what pioneering women such as those just mentioned -- teachers and administrators alike -- did and endured, the view persisted that women were not fit to teach older children or to manage schools (Young, 1990, p. 87). The hegemony of the male provincial inspectorate continued, unquestioned and unrestrained into the 1960's even when, at times, our American counterparts were electing a number of women superintendents (Allison, 1991, p. 37; Schmuck, 1987, p. 87). Then, during the expansionary decades of the 1960's and the 1970's, when inspectors gave way to district superintendents, men continued to be treated as the logical candidates for virtually all administrative positions (see, for example, Reynolds, 1987; Young, 1989).

In Canada today, as in the past, men hold a wider variety of administrative positions related to schools than do women, and men occupy those positions in greater numbers, even though almost

60% of Canada's elementary-secondary school teachers are women (Statistics Canada, 1990, p. 205). Given the provincial jurisdiction over education, some variance prevails from province to province with respect to policies, practices, and proportional statistics. (Rees, 1990; Smith, 1991; Young, 1990). Overall, though, Statistics Canada reports that 25% of Canada's male teachers held school-based administration appointments in 1989-90 compared to 6% of our female teachers. A decade ago, 25% of Canada's male teachers held appointments as principals, vice-principals, or department heads (p. 208). Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. Viewed another way, however, the statistics do show that women now hold more school-based administrative positions than they have in the recent past: 20 % of our school principals, 30% of our vice-principals, and 30% of our department heads are women, compared to 13%, 15%, and 20% a decade ago (p. 209). Line positions in central offices continue to be occupied primarily by men (Rees, 1990).

In other words, Canadian women educators continue to be involved primarily in providing instruction, managing classrooms, and making decisions with respect to individual students rather than in the management and policy-making that affect the world of the classroom. Women most frequently deliver rather than administer public school education, holding very few of the appointed positions that have been the principal organizational means of rewarding merit and cooperation and of providing alternative challenges to those of classroom instruction. We have lacked the power to name (Reynolds, 1987) and value our own experience.

Except for the work of Mary Nixon (1975; Nixon & Gue, 1975), this situation has not received much attention in Canadian academic educational administration circles until recently. Nixon herself was just the third woman to be awarded a doctorate by the U. of A.'s Department of Educational Administration and that was in 1975, almost two decades after the Department was founded. A few other women were students in the doctoral programme during those years, but had not finished the programme. Of the 150 or more doctoral dissertations completed in our Department during those first two decades of its existence, only seven were written by women. Nixon's was the one study to explicitly address the question of women's careers in education, or gender as an issue in educational administration. She surveyed a sample of women administrators and women teachers about attitudes and beliefs affecting their career orientations.

Bergen and Quarshie remarked in 1987 that "...only a beginning has been made in presentations ... concerning ... women in admin" (p. 8). Their analysis by topic/title indicates that, at the annual CASEA conferences between 1974 and 1986, there were a total of six presentations on the topic of women in educational administration. My own review of conference programs since then indicates that there have been another dozen presentations in that topic area (out of about 200 papers

presented, in total). There were few women faculty members in Canadian departments of educational administration until the mid-1980's, although Nixon held sessional appointments in our Department for many years, and other women also held sessional appointments in our Department and others across Canada, from time to time. In the decade of the 1980's, the number of women graduate students in educational administration increased substantially (e.g. Nixon, 1985) and a few women held executive and committee positions in CASEA. Since 1978, not one of the dissertations receiving the annual CASEA award was based on a study of "women's issues," although six of the award-winners have been women.

Until recently, then, women were not only invisible but largely absent from Canadian academic educational administration circles, just as they have been absent from administrative appointments in school systems. Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that a good deal of the research and writing undertaken since Nixon's initial work in the mid-1970's has focused on demographics, barriers to women's entry to educational administration, and career profiles or biographies of women educators and administrators. What have these studies contributed to the Canadian knowledge base in educational administration?

A comprehensive demographic overview of the Canadian situation, on a province by province basis, was commissioned in 1988 by the Canadian Education Association. At that time, the president of the CEA was Naomi Hersom, who was also the president of Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, N.S. and who had been the second woman to earn a doctorate in educational administration from the U. of A. According to Ruth Rees (1990, p. 1), the project director and author of the CEA report, the intent of the CEA study was to establish a statistical baseline regarding the distribution of women and men holding various "positions of added responsibility (beyond classroom teaching)" in each province, to document existing employment equity/affirmative action initiatives, and to recommend strategies for change. Rees (p. 91) concludes that "the situation of women and men in positions within educational systems across Canada reflects that of tradition rather than employment equity."

As Rees points out elsewhere (1991a, p. 9), the tradition includes the persistent *perception* -- indeed, stated with the force of a *conviction* -- on the part of study respondents (school system senior administrators) that "many more men than women were qualified applicants" and that "qualified women did not apply." In related research exploring the relationship between enrolment in the Ontario principals' certification course and subsequent appointment as a school administrator, Rees (1991b; see also Smith, 1991) shows that women sought out the course in ever-increasing numbers once two key "filters" were removed in the early 1980's. The changes

were to eliminate the mandatory summer residency requirement and the referral requirement, which had previously meant that only candidates recommended by their school districts could enrol. Rees demonstrates that, in spite of what is now a large pool of certificated female candidates, only in the two most recent years studied (1988, 1989) were women hired for administrative jobs in the same proportion as they graduated from the certification program. By then, the Ontario government had legislated mandatory hiring targets to increase the representation of women in administrative positions. Subsequently, Rees (1992) has been learning in a follow-up study of graduates from the principals' certification course, that "qualified" women continue to be hesitant about applying for administrative positions because they do not *feel* qualified (or are not made to feel qualified?).

Although not encouraging as a status report, this collection of studies by Rees provides and organizes the sort of information that is a necessary foundation for further policy research (Smith, 1991).[6] Moreover, Rees' work to date supports the contention that systemic discrimination, subtly reinforced and rationalized by traditional socialization, has been and still is a major factor in the under-representation of women in Canadian school administration.

What are some of the other stories behind the statistics and how do they contribute to our knowledge base? Much of the Canadian research on women's careers has been conducted by graduate students, so what I am providing here is a brief description of some of those projects. These are studies that have been carried out within interpretive and critical frameworks, documenting women's experiences using life-history and narrative approaches. That is. they allow us to hear women's own voices, providing some basis for conceptualizing Canadian women educators' career development as it relates to educational administration.

In her doctoral study of selected female and male principals employed by an urban Ontario school board, Reynolds (1987, 1989b) reconstructs the differences and similarities in the career experiences of those who began teaching before 1950 and those who began teaching after that. Women from the earlier group assumed that men would be the administrators, while women in the post-1950 group actively considered the possibility of administrative appointments and were more ready to seek them out in the face of obstacles. Women in the first group were encouraged by male colleagues and superordinates to apply for administrative positions and supported as teachers by their female colleagues. However these women did not find a comparable support group when

---

6 There is probably an interesting case study to be done, for example, on how the changes to the requirements for the Ontario principals' certification course were brought about. To my knowledge, that story has not been told in the public domain.

they became principals, because so few women were in that role. Women in the later group received encouragement for their administrative ambitions from both male and female colleagues, family members and housekeepers, and described the beginnings of women's support networks as part of their experience. Women in the earlier group did overcome their initial doubts about their ability to do the job, but attributed their appointments to working hard and being "in the right place at the right time." Women in the later group were inclined to see their appointments as being linked to a change in societal attitudes, and once appointed, they felt the pressure to be role models for other women. Women in the earlier group regarded career and marriage as two mutually exclusive directions in life: they were single. Women in the later group experienced guilt about their professional/family role conflicts, although these women were of varied marital and family status. To use her own words (1989b, p.6), Reynolds' "transdisciplinary" research "offers a way of formulating and addressing questions about women's work lives in schools" without taking a status quo orientation to the issues.

My own doctoral study (1989) describes anecdotally the careers of some western Canadian women with doctorates in educational administration. The careers mirror a number of the personal and socio-historical features portrayed in Reynolds' work and span a similar period of time, although in different settings. The life stories of my study participants illustrate the complex relation between choice, chance, and opportunity as well as the interweaving of the personal and the professional in career development. As well, two women described organizations that were, for them, "nurturing environments," which provided a combination of support and challenge conducive to professional development. All four women talk about the "competing urgencies" of paid work, academic studies (usually part time) and family responsibilities; these women are "late bloomers" according to traditional (male) career norms of achievement. Their careers are characterized by part-time paid work, fulfilling lateral moves, interruptions in paid work to carry out unpaid care-giving activities, and slower hierarchical progression, when it occurs at all. These women's stories assist us in re-conceptualizing our notions of "career," "opportunity, and "success" in ways that take account of women's priorities and experiences (Young, forthcoming).

Other recent studies highlight a number of dimensions to Canadian women educational administrators' career experiences. Study participants have spoken about the significance of both male and female mentors (Kimmel, 1988; Willis & Dodgson, 1986), role models (Russell & Wright, 1991), and sponsors (Warren, 1989). They have described the diversity of the experiences and of the problems encountered by women principals as well as their initially "haphazard," chance-related career development (Porat, 1985; Warren, 1989) and their sustained focus on classroom activity (Porat). Warren located on a set of continua the adaptation to

administrative roles of several contemporary women in one urban school system. She described their adaptation as ranging from passive/isolated to active/connected and from "knowing" to "not knowing" their organization -- formal and informal -- at the district level. These women were frustrated by the over-reliance of the school system on the informal socialization networks and processes to which they often had limited access. Russell and Wright (1991) have begun to explore the "double whammy" of race and gender in the stories told by women administrators from visible minorities. And other projects reported by Reynolds (1989) extend exploration of women's careers to those who aspire and those who do not aspire to administrative appointments (e.g. Dempsey). Taken all together, this research enriches our understanding of women's careers and points to areas for further research. Unfortunately, little of it sees the light of publication or any other form of widespread dissemination.

If we are building our knowledge base by listening to women relate the stories of their career experiences, we know far less about the policies and politics of the legislative and organizational contexts in which those women lived out their careers. Little research has appeared thus far on strategies for overcoming or eliminating organizational barriers, and the effects of those initiatives on individuals and groups. Willis and Dodgson (1986) report that they presented workshops to senior administrators on their findings about the importance of mentors; this apparently proved to be, at the very least, an awareness-raising exercise for those administrators. Rees (1991-92) draws together pertinent research on collegial "networking," and provides anecdotal illustrations of its efficacy. Nixon (1989) reports on a provincial conference, "Women in the Principalship," organized through the Principals' Institute at the University of Victoria. The conference was oversubscribed and well received. A need for "follow-up and support networks" was identified, as was the need for additional conferences on a regional basis. Reynolds (1989a) reports that Ernst did a comparative study of several affirmative action programs, producing a "comparative framework" that might be fruitfully applied to the study of other affirmative action programs. In summary then, there is some work-in-progress here and there across the country. But few systematic programmes of research, including longitudinal and follow-up studies, appear to be underway.

Taking a highly critical stance toward affirmative action programs (albeit in universities, but he presented the paper at an educational administration conference), Christopher Hodgkinson has recently described such initiatives as a "pathology in higher education" (1991, p. 3). Intelligent and informed critique is the stuff of good scholarly exchange and, as I have just indicated, much exploration of policy initiatives and their impact remains to be done. However, Hodgkinson's paper, called "The Inequity of Equity: A Politically Incorrect Paper," is a disappointingly cavalier

treatment of the issues and of the extant literature on the topic. Hodgkinson confirms his own acceptance of "the traditional concept of merit as competence and accomplishment" (p. 17), although he defines neither competence nor accomplishment, and then goes on to assert in his most positivistic fashion that "truth" has lately been "subordinated to ideology "(p. 30). He dismisses the importance of diverse role models on the grounds that "merit or efficiency and effectiveness in the job" are criteria absolutely unrelated to gender. Hodgkinson sees clearly the fallacies in the arguments of the "P.C.s." (the politically correct) but overlooks the tautology of his own argument.

Moreover, his discussion ignores the substantial and substantive efforts of many scholars to bring clarity and understanding to the terms, concepts, and issues associated with the equity debate (e.g. in Canada, Gaskell, McLaren, & Novogrodsky, 1989). Both Watkinson (1991b) in a paper arguing for affirmative action, and McCormack (1991) responding to media coverage of "political correctness" at Canadian universities, address a number of the issues which have so exercised Hodgkinson. I will not repeat their arguments here, although Watkinson's and McCormack's application of the arguments to the Canadian context is a contribution to our knowledge base.

What I find most disturbing about Hodgkinson's paper is his refusal to acknowledge the possibility of a knowledge base that incorporates, let alone might be founded on, any but the traditional academic canon created by white anglo-saxon males like himself. If, as he asserts, "men and women are in *fact* [his emphasis] fundamentally different" then the inclusion of both women and men in academia and the inclusion of both sets of perspectives and experiences in our knowledge base should be a welcome enrichment of the traditional, androcentric knowledge base that he defends with such vigour. Hodgkinson indicates that he felt he had to muster his courage in order to confront what he claims is the swell of Political Correctness on Canadian as well as U.S. university campuses. With reference to Canadian academic educational administration circles, it seems unlikely that the threat is imminent. Feminist perspectives and equity issues represent, at most, an undercurrent rather than a tidal wave of either scholarship or activism. We're not there yet, Professor Hodgkinson.

We are, however, seeing the influence of feminist perspectives on our conceptualizations of school administration and leadership. Renzo (reported in Reynolds, 1989a) found in one survey study that women administrators expressed more concern about principal-teacher relationships and democratic leadership styles than did the men, and twice as many of the women indicated that gender was a significant factor in their relations with staff. In Gougeon's (1991) studies of principal-teacher communication, female principals were seen to rely more on intrinsic and reward-

oriented extrinsic motivation in their communication with teachers than male principals. The men were seen to rely more on negative extrinsic motivation with an emphasis on rules and regulations. Female teachers indicated that their communication with female principals was more supportive and growth-oriented than their communication with male principals. Other studies of the leadership styles demonstrated by women administrators and work on the re-conceptualization of power is underway in three or four universities across the country, if the presentation proposals for the 1992 CASEA annual conference are any indication (Levin, 1992).

Approaching educational administration from a very different angle, Watkinson (1991) traces the Supreme Court of Canada's emphasis on an empathetic, contextualized approach to the definition of human rights and suggests that this "ethic of care" should likewise be adopted by school administrators and addressed in administrator preparation programs. Studying the impact of the ten year-old Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on Canadian educational administration, Watkinson analyses a number of appeals on human rights issues that have been heard by the Supreme Court in the past decade. She finds that the Court has given a substantive ("considering the circumstances of the particular other") rather than a procedural interpretation to the notion of equality. She argues that this stance has enormous implications for school administrators, who may either adopt a similar approach voluntarily or have it imposed on them by the courts. In her view, educational administration that relies on a traditional "just" attitude and lacks "caring, the ability to empathize, to 'get into the skin' of the other" is "like the Tinman in the Wizard of Oz -- it has no heart" (p. 3). Watkinson's work is important not only for the values it introduces but for the link it makes between the legal and governance context of Canadian education, and its administration from day to day.

Four of us who are working together at the U of A (Joly, McIntyre, Staszenski, & Young, 1991) also explore the metaphor of the heart in relation to educational administration and leadership. The research to this point consists of three independent studies of leadership as it is seen and enacted by selected women educators. The studies describe the careers, activities, perspectives, and impact of several women -- classroom teachers, consultants, school administrators -- who have been identified as educational leaders. These studies contribute to the growing evidence that there are women leaders (not only those who have formal roles as administrators) whose praxis incorporates connectedness, empowerment, and caring. We also examine the values at the centre, or heart, of such leadership. It is the concepts of care and justice which together constitute the "heart" of this reconstruction and make it distinctive, as well as particularly significant for educators. For, despite its frequent association with cliched expressions of sentiment, the word "heart" denotes "the whole personality, including intellectual as well as emotional functions or

traits" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary, 1986). This sense of the word captures important aspects of our re-conceptualization of leadership. implying the integration rather than the separation of "affect and intellect" (Regan, 1990, p 571), the equality of emotion and reason, the complementarity of care and justice that we mean by the phrase "Leading from the Heart." We believe that our perspective on leadership re-focuses attention on ethics in context, avoiding the dangerous over-simplifications of both recipes and rules. Moreover, the combination of care and justice illustrates the potential for rich understanding that is available to us when we join feminist scholarship with other intellectual traditions.

Our work is indebted not only to contemporary feminist scholarship but also to the Greenfield - Hodgkinson emphasis on values and ethics, although -- ironically -- both these men would make and keep gender invisible. I have already discussed Hodgkinson's views on this subject. And, for his part, Greenfield states unequivocally that "Language is power. It literally makes reality appear and disappear" (1984, p. 154). Yet, he chooses to write in "the inclusive language of tradition," meaning the "generic he" (1991, p. 1). I remain surprised that Greenfield, who is so sensitive to matters of meaning, values, and context, refuses to acknowledge gender as a significant dimension of knowledge (re)construction.

Indeed, gender continues to be a non-issue for many Canadian academics in educational administration. Only two years ago I was asked to contribute an "add-on" chapter about women in school administration to a book that purported to address contemporary issues in Canadian education. The request for such a chapter originated with a reviewer for a prospective publisher, not with the Canadian academic who was the book's editor. Of that book's 16 chapters, mine is the only one that explicitly considers gender as an issue in education. Perhaps it is also telling that I am one of only two women listed as contributors to the book. And one Canadian educational administration textbook has been published recently whose author employs (without discussion or apology) the generic "he" rather than gender-neutral language, even when referring to teachers. Providing yet another illustration of the invisibility issue, Rees (1992b) comments on her experience when she sought publication for her article related to the principalship certification program (1991b). Two of the three initial reviewers felt that the article should not be published because the content was not significant, and a third reviewer felt that it was worth publishing. Rees correctly guessed that the first two reviewers were male and queried their "unaccepting patriarchal attitude." Rees knew the editor of the journal, who was a woman, and felt comfortable raising this issue. As a result, additional women reviewers were involved and they judged the substance of the article to be worthy of publication.

The impact of feminist scholarship has not yet been felt much in Canadian educational administration circles, although for years it has been a significant dimension of work in other areas of educational theory and research. Considerable uneasiness exists about the term "feminist," and misunderstanding of its multiple meanings. The uneasiness is derived, in part, from ignorance about feminism -- that it comes in a variety of shapes and sizes; that it is relevant to the study of most subjects; that it is an analytical and transformative perspective ("Aren't these just people issues after all?" "We've all been doing it this way, all along"); that narratives might be more than "just stories." Yet, Canadian women tell me again and again how much it matters to them to hear our own stories being told.

Other factors constrain our feminist scholarship, besides the ignorance, denial, and attachment to the status quo that persist in some quarters. Given our small population compounded by the particularly "small worlds" of Canadian education and its administration, ethical issues regarding confidentiality and the identifiability of study participants virtually preclude some investigations or, at least, limit severely the way that findings may be reported. As well, feminist scholars have an activist orientation that means directing precious energy and effort to advocacy work (Reynolds, 1991). Furthermore, academics in educational administration are frequently called upon to or interested in applying their knowledge of organizations and administration by taking on administrative positions: that was true of Naomi Hersom and at the moment it describes the two Canadian women academics who have most consistently contributed feminist perspectives to academic educational administration in the past few years, Ruth Rees and Cecilia Reynolds. Overall though, the increasing number of women students and faculty members -- even though many of them disclaim any association with "feminists" -- is creating a greater demand that women's experiences and perspectives, as well as men's, be taken into account. But we're not there yet.

A feminist critique does make problematic our existing Canadian knowledge base. If our response to the Greenfield challenge has been, in part, to make visible the Canadian schools and schooling that earlier theorizing had rendered invisible, I hope that our response to the feminist challenge will be to make women and gender more visible. In her discussion of the contemporary Canadian context, Hersom (1991) identified a number of gender issues that invite, indeed demand, our explorations. Many relate to the evolving roles of women in our society and the implications for education, and to the intersection of gender with race (our bilingual, multicultural, and native peoples), class, and age. What policies, practices, values are the people who work in our school organizations living out from day to day in the face of these often competing claims?

Not "There" Yet

Where is "there"? For me, "there" means a situation involving not merely tolerance but understanding and acceptance of various approaches to knowledge generation, ways of knowing, types of knowledge. I am not referring to what Greenfield calls "pragmatic eclecticism" (1992, p.8), which looks to me like New Age Positivism (MacKinnon, Young, & Hansen, 1990, p. 46). Nor am I referring to the "political correctness" so feared by Hodgkinson. Rather, I am referring to an attitude that welcomes our increasingly complex mosaic of perspectives and peoples.

As a Canadian, I feel strongly our need to consolidate and continue to develop a Canadian knowledge base in educational administration, to know ourselves better. As an activist, I feel strongly our need for a more equitable distribution of women, men, and power throughout our school organizations. As a teacher in education administration, I feel strongly our need to ground our own praxis more explicitly in caring and community as well as justice, learning to listen to one another's stories thoughtfully and to engage together as well as individually in critical reflection about our values-in-action. As a scholar, I feel strongly that we must listen more closely to those voices -- past and present, including women's --that have been and frequently still are silenced. We must continue the work of re-conceptualizing our notions and re-shaping our organizations. We are not "there" yet.

References

Allison, D. J. (1991, Sept.) Contrast and convergence in the development of educational administration in the United States and Canada. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Bergen, J. J. & Quarshie, J. (1987). Historical Perspective on the Development of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

Bezeau, L. M. (1989). *Educational administration for Canadian teachers*. Missisauga, Ont: Copp, Clark, Pitman.

Coleman, P. & LaRocque, L. (1990). *Struggling to be 'Good Enough': Administrative practices and school district ethos*. London: Falmer Press.

Danylewycz, M. & Prentice, A. (1986). Revising the history of teachers: A Canadian perspective. *Interchange*, 17(2), 35-46.

Deblois, C. (1979). Challenge to administrative theory. *Canadian Administrator*, 18(4), 1-6.

Deblois, C. (1991, Sept.). Preparation of school leaders: The Quebec case. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Deblois, C. (1992, Feb.). Personal communication regarding a recent survey of educational administration professors in Canada.

Evans, R. (1991, Sept.) From applied science to hermeneutics: Requirements of a normative science of educational administration. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Fleming, T. & Craig, M. (1990, June). The anatomy of a resignation: Margaret Strong and the New Westminster school board, 1913-1915. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for the Study of Education, Victoria, British Columbia.

Fleming, T., Smyly, C., & White, J. (1990). Lottie Bowron within organizational realities and bases of power. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 5(2), 7-31.

Gaskell, J., McLaren, A., & Novogrodsky, M. (1989). *Claiming an education: Feminism and Canadian schools*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Giles, T.E. & Proudfoot, A.J. (1990). *Educational administration in Canada (4th ed.)*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Gougeon, T.D. (1991, June). Principal-teacher cross gender communication; A replication study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, Kingston, Ontario.

Greenfield, T. (1981). Who's asking the question depends on what answer you get. In R.G. Townsend & S.B. Lawton (Eds.), *What's so Canadian about Canadian educational administration?* Toronto: OISE Press.

Greenfield, T. (1984). Leaders and schools: Wilfulness and nonnatural order in organizations. In J.J. Sergiovanni & J.E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 142-169.

Greenfield, T. (1991, Sept.). Science and service: The making of the profession of educational administration. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Greenfield, T. (1992). Re-forming and re-valuing educational administration: Whence and when cometh the phoenix? *Educational Management and Administration*, 20(1).

Gue, L.R. (1977). *An introduction to educational administration in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Haughey, M. (1992, January 14th). Private communication.

Haughey, M. & Rowley, D. (1991) Principals as change agents. *Canadian Administrator*, 30(8), 1-9.

Hersom, N. (1991, Sept.). Implications of emerging challenges in education for the practice and study of educational administration. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Hickox, E. (1981). O say can you see our home and native land. In R.G. Townsend & S.B. Lawton (Eds.), *What's so Canadian about Canadian educational administration?* Toronto: OISE Press.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991, Sept.). The iniquity of equity: A politically incorrect paper. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Joly, L., McIntyre, S., Staszenski, D., & Young, B. (1991, Sept.). Leading from the heart: A feminist reconstruction of educational leadership. Symposium presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Kimmel, S. (1988). Women in administration: The Calgary Board of Education story. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Calgary.

Lam, Y.L.J. (Ed.) (1990). *Canadian public education system: Issues and prospects*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Levin, B. (1991). Coping with a changing world. Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Levin, B. (1992, Feb.). Private communication.

MacKay, D.A. (1990). Policy processes in Alberta Education: An analysis of four studies. *Canadian Administrator*, 30(1), 1-7.

MacKinnon, D., Young, B., & Hansen, B. (1990). On valid knowledge. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 5(2), 39-51.

McCormack, T. (1991). "Politically correct." *Canadian Forum*, 70(802), 8-10.

Maynes, W.G. (1991). The education of Edmonton's urban poor: A policy perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, Chicago, Ill.

Miklos, E. (1990). Evolution in Doctoral Research in Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, 1985-1990. Edmonton, AB: Department of Educational Administration.

Miklos, E. (1991). Trends in doctoral research in educational administration. *Alberta Journal of Research in Education,* 37(4), 297-321.

Nixon, M. (1975). Women administrators and women teachers: A comparative study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Nixon, M. (1985). Women in administration: Is it wishful thinking? *The ATA Magazine*, 65(4), 4-8.

Nixon, M. (1987). Few women in school administration: Some explanations. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 21(2), 63-70.

Nixon, M. (1989). An old problem: Will new approaches come? *The ATA Magazine*, 69(3), 41-43.

Nixon, M. & Gue, L.R. (1975). Women administrators and women teachers: A comparative study. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XXI(3), 196-206.

Porat, K.L. (1985). The woman in the principal's chair. *The ATA Magazine*, 65(4), 10-15.

Rees, R. (1990). *Women and men in education*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.

Rees, R. (1991a). Changing hiring patterns: A case of changing perceptions. *Education Canada*, Fall, 8 - 15.

Rees, R. (1991b). The Ontario principals' qualifications course: Towards employment equity? *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations,* 6(1), 37 - 52.

Rees, R. (1991-1992). Networking: A crucial strategy for women on the move. *FWTAO Newsletter*, December-January, 27-31.

Rees, R. (1992a, Feb.). Private communication.

Rees, R. (1992b, April). Private communication.

Regan, H. (1990). Not for women only: School administration as a feminist activity. *Teachers College Record*, 91(4), 565-577.

Reynolds, C. (1987). Naming the experience: Women, men, and their changing work lives as teachers and principals. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

Reynolds, C. (1989a, March). Some new directions for research on affirmative action. Paper presented at Focus on Leadership, Toronto, Ontario.

Reynolds, C. (1989b). Man's world/woman's world: Women's roles in schools. *Women's Education des Femmes*, 7(3), 29-33.

Reynolds, C. (1991, June). Integrating feminist scholarship into teacher education. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of CSSE, Kingston, Ontario.

Russell, R.J. & Wright, R.L. (1991, June). The socialization experiences of minority women in educational administration positions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, Kingston, Ontario.

Schmuck, P.A. (1987). Women school employees in the United States. In P.A. Schmuck Ed.) *Women educators: Employees of schools in Western countries*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Schwartz, A.M. (1986). Teaching hatred: The politics and morality of Canada's Keegstra affair. *Canadian and International Education*, XV(2), 5-28.

Schwartz, A.M. (1992, April). Private communication.

Shakeshaft, C. (1991, April). A cup half full: A gender critique of the knowledge base in educational administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, Chicago, Ill.

Smith, L. (1991). Research notes: The gender composition of the pool of prospective school principals. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 16(2), 198 - 205.

Statistics Canada. (1990). *Education in Canada: A statistical review for 1988-89*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Sussel, T.A. & Manley-Casimir, M.E. (1986). The Supreme Court of Canada as "National School Board": The Charter and educational reform. In M.Ed. Manley-Casimir & T.A. Sussel (Eds.), *Courts in the classroom.*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Tardif, C. (1990). French-language minority education: Political and pedagogical issues. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, 15(4), 400-413.

Tardif, C. (1991, Oct.) L'identite culterelle: Perceptions et croyances des enseignants dans les ecoles francophones minoritaires. Paper presented at the 3e Congrès des sciences de l'éducation de langue française au Canada, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ont.

Townsend, R.G & Lawton, S.B. (Eds.) (1981). *What's so Canadian about Canadian educational administration?* Toronto: OISE Press.

Warren, J. (1989). The role socialization of female school administrators. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Watkinson, A.M. (1991, June). Equality, empathy and education. A paper presented at the annual meeting of CASEA, Kingston, Ontario.

Watkinson, A.M. (1991, Sept.). Affirmative action; Challenge and change? Paper presented at Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change, Edmonton, Alberta.

Willis, H. & Dodgson, J. (1986). Mentoring of Canadian women in educational administration. *Canadian Administrator*, 25(7).

Young, B. (1989). Not finished yet: The stories of four women's careers in education. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Young, B. (1990). Not there yet: Women in educational administration. In Y.L.J. Lam (Ed.), *The Canadian public school system: Issues and prospects*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Young, B. (forthcoming). On careers: Themes from the lives of four western Canadian women educators. *Canadian Journal of Education./Revue Canadienne de l'éducation.*